

A NEW THINKING FOR A NEW WORLD. REPRESENTATIONS FROM ECONOMY

Negucioiu Aurel

"Dimitrie Cantemir" Christian University, Bucharest, Faculty of Economics, Cluj-Napoca

An incursion, even a succinct one, incomplete, in the universal history, in the world economic history and not in the least in the real world gives more and more "credit" to the idea according to which the movement is the main form of existence – working and evolution – of the society, economy, and of all the structures they are made of.

Movement means first of all change, transformation. Its "propellant", its internal cause is represented, in our opinion, by the unity and interaction of opposites. The changes, the transformations taking place in society and in its economy have direct or indirect authors the human beings who, using their minds, "leaven bread" and express at the beginning through thinking, the objectives that are going to complete or lessen reality. The positive changes and transformations that the people operate renew the world.

For more than half of a century, the humankind has been in a vast and very complex process of transformation, changes with innovative character. In other words, a process of building a new world. Hence, the need to create a new thinking. "A new thinking for a new world". Making a halt in the field of economics – theory, science and practice – we are trying to bring to attention to those interested a few considerations concerning the truth value of some paradigms in the theoretical circuit, including their degree of rationality or irrationality.

Key words: capital, industrial capital, commercial capital, financial capital, human capital, social capital, microeconomics, mezoconomics, macroeconomics, national economy, mondial economy, mondoeconomy, world economy, economic development, eco-economic development, eco-economics, economic system, ecologic system, ecosystem, ecosoceco system, economic culture, community, society, knowledge based society, knowledge based economy, economic paradox, social paradox, scientific paradox, economic risk, economic chaos, economic disorder, uncertainty, economic truth, economic transition, economic society, international society, post-capitalist society, digital economy, real economy, virtual economy, symbolical economy, market, rift, discontinuance.

1. Instead of introduction

<< Everything starts as somebody's daydream. Life is made of the thoughts men have every day>>

– Ralph Waldo Emerson –

<< Any time a newly formed concept of the last sensations enters the store of memory, we encounter another one related to it, as soon as it is received by it, and it, alike, attracts another related one and so on >>

– Ian Amos Comenius –

<< The action which does not lead itself according to a thought (therefore a theory) is nothing but unconscious, blind action, like that of a highly strung arch when slacking. >>

– Eugeniu Speranția –

<< The history of the written word started 6000 years ago. The words say, the words explain and give advice, the words change, the words win, the words tempt, the words touch... Nothing is stronger than the right word at the right moment >>

– Mark Twain –

<< Self-control is the highest virtue, and wisdom is to speak truth and consciously to act according to nature>>

– Heraclitus –

<< In the domain of Political Economy, free scientific inquiry meets not merely the same

enemies as in all other domains. The peculiar nature of the materials it deals with, summons as foes into the field of battle the most violent, mean and malignant passions [...] the Furies of private interest >>

– Karl Marx –

<< Great historical men - whose own particular aims involve the substantial which is the will of the world- spirit. ... World historical individuals are those in whose aims such a general principle lies >>

– G.W.Hegel –

<< Thought is a key to all treasures; the miser's gains are ours without his cares >>

<< The key to all sciences is unquestionably the question mark. To the word HOW? we owe most of our greatest discoveries. Wisdom in life may perhaps consist in asking ourselves on all occasions: WHY? >>

– H. De Balzac –

<< Science is the eye watching, searching, making, thinking, waiting, catching the light, adding to past centuries the burden of the new centuries and, patient guard of time grabs from the universe, piece by piece, its timeless secrets >>

– Lacordaire –

<< Market economy is inherently unstable, and the source of its instability is based on the logics of its financial markets, that is why is necessary that the government steps in as a regulator >>

– J. M. Keynes –

<< ... the only important structural obstacles to world prosperity are the obsolete doctrines that *clutter* the minds of men >>

– Paul Krugman –

<< There is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come >>

– Victor Hugo –

2. Raising the problem

The concept of <<WORLD>> is a particularly rich concept in meanings belonging to the linguistic circuit, in people's language. According to several encyclopaedias, explanatory dictionaries of different languages and in other works, the concept designates, shows: 1. Everything that exists in reality – the material world (the world of things) and its reflection spiritual world (the world of ideas); universe, cosmos. 2. An assembly made up of Earth and visible stars, considered as an organized system; planetary system, solar system. 3. A vast field of reality distinguishing itself from others by one or several fundamental characteristics (alive world, organic world, inorganic world). To these meanings, the sources mentioned add more meanings that we call *particular* meanings and which, no doubt, enrich to a considerable extent the content of the concept of <<WORLD>>.

What we are interested in here is the assembly made up of Earth and visible stars considered as an organized making (organized system) – therefore, the <<Planet Earth>> system and its framework, economic and eco-economic realities. And here only the beginning – raising the problem.

The world, considering all the meanings of the term (concept) was, is and will be in a continuous movement. The movement represents the existence *mode* of the organic and inorganic world, and *time* and space are *its fundamental, general coordinates*. It – the movement, comes to life in the totality of *changes*, transformations, processes taking place in the universe, in and between their systems and subsystems. For representation, we mention that the movement and, thus, the change takes the shape of such processes or actions as: growth, depression and decrease, becoming, development and fall, progress and regress, evolution and involution.

From another point of view, the change takes the shape and comes to life through innovation, invention, improvement and modernization. Saying this we should not

forget that in reality there are not only these processes which, through their content and consequences are *positive*, but also processes and actions which connect us, such as imbalance, disorganization, destabilization and others.

Through the processes mentioned which give content and shape to movement and change is done the *passing* from past, to present and then to future or what means the passing from *old* to *new* in the real world and the world of ideas on it. Getting here we state that *the new* is not always superior, better, more beautiful, more efficient and necessarily more valuable than *the old* that it has replaced. This paradigm is available both for action and for thought.

The truth is that our earthly world that we are considering among us is changing, is transforming, therefore it is renewing itself with a speed many times unnoticeable, on larger and larger and more and more profound surfaces. The technical base of the capitalist society economy has climbed the stairs of progress with a speed that increased together with time. The simple labour mechanization gave way to complex mechanization and this, in its turn, was more and more passed by automation in different forms and higher and higher performances. The science has come down from the <<ivory tower >>, has transformed into an endogenous factor of production, of man's activity in general, has merged with the other factors of production in a more and more complete scientific and technical revolution which, for several years, has had a striking world character. Also, world like are the communication and information revolution. Currently, a harder and harder to pronounce „word”, that is a more and more significant role goes to the invisible revolution whose units of measurement start with the phrase <<*nano*>> – nanosecond, nanometre or nano-millimetre.

Related to these changes in the running and evolution of the capitalist economy, *the industrial capital* crowned as a „king”,

„emperor” or „president” – was deposed and replaced with the *financial capital* and nowadays the trend pushing to this „high” rank *the human capital* is stronger and stronger.

The <<*Mendeleev's periodic table* >> of the changes having taken place in the last 25-30 years in the contemporary world that our planet includes in its columns, the collapse of the old colonial system, the collapse of the socialist systems of economy and government, the formation of the third world, the expansion of the market economy through the orientation towards it of many of the socialist countries. A special part of this periodic table of elements includes by nominalization the cyclic, national, international and world economic crises, the financial crises within the same borders, the energetic, demographic crisis, the increasing economic and social inequalities among the world countries, the government and administration crises, the crises of science, education, culture, the increasing deterioration of domestic and international relations. And the things do not stop here. They do not merely exhaust the entire assembly of the changes having taken place and of those in progress.

2.1. World and thinking

The title of our lines was inspired by the well-known titan of economic thinking Charles Handy who inscribed on the three books translated into Romanian, too, the following *postulate-message*: <<*New thinking for a new world* >> (1)

Here, a *new* or a relatively new problem arises, that is the ratio or better said the ratios between *world* and *thinking*, between *the new world* and *the new thinking*.

Without lingering too much on this problem, yet it is an extremely important and contemporary problem for the scientific theory of knowledge (for epistemology), we will mention the following reasons:

1. The concept of <<World>> in its most general and comprehensible

meaning subsumes and expresses according to dictionaries “everything that exists in reality (material world, the world of things), universe, cosmos”. It means that thinking – regarded as process and result (the world of thoughts) constitutes an important component of the world considering the meaning mentioned above.

2. Therefore, the new thinking is an essential component of the new world.

3. The thinking (the knowledge) has an especially complex structure, containing several subdivisions or components. Karl R. Popper distinguishes the following *worlds* or *universes*: << first of all, the world of objects or that of physical states; secondly, the world of conscious states or mental states or, probably, of behavioural moods to act; thirdly, the world of the *objective contents of thinking*, especially of scientific and poetic thinking of works of art”. (2)

4. Continuing his examination, Karl R. Popper supports the existence of *two meanings* of knowledge or thinking: 1) *subjective knowledge or thinking* consisting in a state of mind or consciousness or of the behavioural or reaction mood and 2) *objective knowledge or thinking* consisting in problems, theories and arguments per se. In this view, knowledge is completely independent from anyone’s claim to know; it is, also, *knowing without knower*; it is *knowing without a knower subject* (3)

5. All these worlds of the new thinking represent organized components of the *new world* and their ratio is a ratio between *part* (new thinking) and *whole* (new world).

6. The ratios between new thinking and new world are especially numerous. It has been stated earlier that *Thinking* is part of the *world* and that the *new thinking* is part of the *new world*. Both are generated by predominantly objective causes, they appear, function, and evolve through spontaneous, consciously directed or mixed mechanisms.

The phrase <<*New thinking for a new world*>> represents, in our opinion, a postulate-message for the present time and especially for the future. This paradigm subsumes and concentrates in itself at least the following truths:

a) The system of the earthly world includes in itself a necessary component, human thinking.

b) The *new world*, already configured and built, organized, whose real existence is planet Earth, which legitimates it, contains as a constituent part of it a *new thinking* which describes it and shows, through the whole of thoughts, concepts, ideas, principles and laws.

c) The world seen as reality is the *object* of human beings’ thinking (of knowledge) and imagination. This object is covered by thinking from numerous angles, as a state, in movement, therefore changing and transforming itself, in the past and in the present. In this situation, thinking is *imitating and photographing* with the help of its own instruments what can be called the *copies* of different components of the real world or its *copies*, seen as a whole. It means that the real world *precedes* thinking or what is the same as thinking *follows* closer or farther the real world. What we have said so far represent only a true aspect, especially important, but, yet, only *an aspect* of the ratios between the real earthly world and thinking.

Another aspect – the second in our enumeration – consists in the irrefutable fact that thinking *foresees and precedes* more and more of the movements, therefore changes, transformations of different components of the planet Earth's system and, for many times, not only this.

To represent and ease the comprehension of this truth, we will further refer to the process of labour or production of goods which is *specific to human kind*, quoting Karl Marx : "a spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the *imagination* of the labourer at its commencement. He not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works, but he also realises a *purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will. And this subordination is no mere momentary act.* Besides the exertion of the bodily organs, the process demands that, during the whole operation, the workman's *will be steadily in consonance with his purpose.* (4)

The history of earthly world, the history of human kind history mentioned in its pages that, in time, the role and importance of thinking has increased in more and more pronounced rhythms. Presently, the role of *forerunner* and *notary* of the evolution of society and economy on the steps of progress' historical ladder is being acknowledged. Moreover. There are savants stating with observable arguments that science and education must develop in more accelerated rhythms than the other structures of contemporary society.

And something else, too. A third aspect of the ratios between the real world and new

thinking is the expansion and thoroughgoing study of the processes of *thinking's rethinking*. Thinking is being rethought and, therefore, it is *renewing* and *re-renewing* and the patrimony of thoughts is getting *richer* both quantitatively and qualitatively. The value and the use value (utility), in other words the cognitive value and the applicative value of the new thoughts/ideas, enrich the world's fortune, the intellectual and material potential increases too, and, together with it, the possibilities, conditions of enriching and beautifying the style and way of living and those of levelling the standard living are amplified.

The truth is that the material forces and things can be destroyed only with material forces, but the *ideas, new ideas* have a considerable influence from the moment they have been understood and entered the world. "If we watch history from a larger perspective, it seems that the most influential people in the last 100 years – Charles Handy writes – were not Hitler or Churchill, Stalin or Gorbachev, but Freud, Marx and Einstein, people who did not change anything *except the way in which we think, but this thing has changed everything.* Francis Crick *is not today* a name known by everybody, but he is the one who, together with James Watson and Maurice Wilking, discovered the genetic code, the DNA, creating, thus, the science of microbiology and biotechnology industry that so much of our economic future might depend so much on." (5)

3. Eco-economy - A new branch of contemporary thinking (knowledge)

The tree of knowledge, of science (thinking) was completed at the end of the 20th century with a new branch. Its name is ***eco-economy***. It is under construction, enlargement and thorough study of its own object of study – the *real eco-economy* – the birth of this new branch of science about nature, society and economy, its ontological status, its anatomic-morphological structure, its functioning and evolution mechanism, its categories,

principles and laws governing the movement of this economic-social-ecological mega-system, the order and disorder coexisting or succeeding, the mutual reports existing among the constituent parts of the mega-system as well as between the latter and each component, in part; and last, but not least, among the ecosocico systemic structure and other systems existing in the universe.

A radiography even insufficiently detailed of the *national economies* shows that these exist, function, and evolve in a multiple environment: *social-national and international*, in an *international economic environment*, to which the *political, cultural, and moral* environment are added.

The mutual reports between economy and the surrounding natural environment were born together with the human society and its economy. They multiplied, diversified, and changed structurally and qualitatively together *with* and *as* the human society and surrounding nature evolved.

The interactions between man (people) and nature, the multitude of relations and correlations in which these interactions took shape, manifested and still manifest themselves *gave content to these new branches and sub-branches of scientific knowledge and some specific genres of human activities*. The <<*vita activa*>> itself designates and underlines *three* fundamental activities: labour, work and action, each of them corresponding to <<one of the basic conditions in which man was given life on earth >> (6) Underlying the significance of each component of this <<*vita activa*>> Hannah wrote "Labour is that activity which corresponds to the *biological* process of the human *body*, whose spontaneous growth, metabolism, and eventual decay are bound to the vital necessities produced and fed into the life process by labour. The *human condition* of labour is life itself." (7)

"Labour is the activity corresponding to the *unnatural* character of the human existence, which is not imprinted *in* and whose death is *not* compensated by the perpetual cycle of

species life. Labour provides an <<artificial>> world of objects, entirely different *from* any natural environment.

Within the borders of this artificial world, each individual life finds shelter, while the world itself is meant to last longer and exceed all individual lives. *The human condition* of work *means* belonging to the world." (8)

"Action, the only activity that actually takes place between people without the mediation of objects or matter, corresponds to the *human condition of plurality*, that *men*, not the *Man*, live on earth and pollute the world. Although all aspects of the human condition are specifically the *condition* - not just a *sin qua non conditio* but also *conditio* per quam - to any political life." (9)

"The earth is just the quintessence of the human condition and as far as we know, the worldly nature is the only one in the universe that can provide human beings with a living environment where they can move and breathe effortless and without using artificial means. The artificial of the man-made world separates the human existence from any pure animal environment, but life itself is outside the artificial world and through life man remains related to all other living organisms." (10)

Above all, the labour, the production of material goods necessary to meet needs, interests, desires and human goals represented, still represents and will represent a *system* of relationships, a *process between men and nature*, a process in which people cooperating in a certain way and exchanging activities, intercede, regulate and control through their own activity the exchange of substances, of matter and energy between them and nature. Therefore the process of production and reproduction of material goods necessary for human living and society is, in a sense, the dialectical unity of a system of relationships - relationships that are established between people and relationships taking place between people, society and natural environment. The multiple interaction between man (humans), society and its

economy on one hand and the nature surrounding them on the other hand, is a *real* component of the universe where we are, one of its *mega-systems*.

4. Economy and ecology - Autonomy, identity, differences and unity

4.1. Economy and ecology

Undoubtedly, the *real economy* (the *real economic system*) and the *real ecosystem* (the *real ecological system* or the *natural environment*) as component parts of the objective - material reality have *their own ontological status* and thus their movement - functioning and evolution are mainly governed by *the laws of the universe* and by its *own laws* (specific laws). These components have their *relative autonomy and independence*. The *real economy* includes in its structure and content the assembly of all *productive forces*, the assembly of the *relationships* is established between people and the framework of the economic activity. The two assemblies - the productive forces and economic relations - seen in their unit and interaction - form what experts call *the mode of production* or the *economic system* in the extensive meaning of the term. In its turn, *the global ecological system* stands for the biocenosis and biotope assembly. These systems have the *self-creation, self-preservation and self-progress* ability by means of their own mechanisms. It is not accidental that the two systems – the ecological system and the economic system – represent *the objective* of some *distinct branches* of *science*, the *environmental science* and *economics*. The simple observation of reality shows that the ecological system and the economic system are not separated from each other by insurmountable borders and walls. And even more. There are not few situations where the economic and the ecological, more precisely parts of the economic constitute components of the ecological and vice versa, parts of the ecological represent components of the economic. The *ecological* is *economic* and

the economic is *environmentally friendly*. Meaning what? There are not few situations where the economic and the ecological, more precisely parts of the economic constitute components of the ecological and vice versa, parts of the ecological represent components of the economic. The *ecological* is *economic* and *the economic* is *environmentally friendly*. Meaning what? Meaning what? It is simply like that: people like all living things belong to nature, to the real ecosystem. And not only that. As many scholars argue *the man is the highest product of nature*. At the same time *labour force* represents *the most important factor of production*, one of the most important *forms of capital* – the *human capital*. The human capacity to work, the labour has always been one of the most important *economic assets*: under certain conditions it - labour - was a *commodity* and thus subject to the provisions, to the sale-purchase transactions. It is again the man, regarded as subject and actor of the economic life to get some other *economic co-determinations* as well, depending on the *place* he occupied and the *role* he fulfilled within the economic system. Thus, he was, is and will be the owner or non-proprietor, manufacturer, distributor, dealer, customer, creditor or debtor, or more at the same time, supplier, seller or buyer of goods| he is an agriculture farmer industrialist and / or small craftsman.

Yet, the process of reproduction and perpetuation of human beings is also, as it can be easily understood, *a complex biological, economic, social and cultural process*. (11) Simultaneously, other parts of nature become *real elements* of the economy at the moment and provided that they enter the economic cycle, the real economic flows.

The wood (tree) cut from a natural forest becomes raw material for the furniture manufacturing factory as well as for the pulp or paper manufacturer. The wood meant for home heating is a non random economic asset for consumption. It is also the case of other component parts of nature: coal, oil, natural

gas extracted and put into use as capital goods or consumer goods. The *land* itself is and is becoming part of the economy as a *means* of work, *object* of labour and *material requirement* of performing the production process. And it is not only that. The land gives every man <<locus standi>> and ongoing space for his actions. (12) The facts stated before are true to reality, and consequently they are truths - *relative* and not absolute truths, partial and not total truths. Why? Because the ecological and economic *identity* is *neither absolute nor complete* it is only partial and relative. Among them there were, there are and there will always exist numerous differences. To illustrate this truth Jacques Bonnet mentioned conurbations, techno-polls (techno polis), scientific and technological parks, teleports, innovation centres, business and commercial parks, industrial areas, highways advanced countries like streaking through the heavens surface rivers and streams. To these, the nominal economy, the symbolic economy, the entire set of activities, relationships and financial flows with flows of scientific, political, cultural, economic, electronic money flows, which together with the flows of scientific, political, cultural, economic information, with flows of electronic money, constituting what scientists have called <<invisible flows >> and managing <<visible flows>> object - material goods respectively, other object goods - and people in motion. (13)

4.2. Ecology and economics – two sides of the same coin

At the risk of repeating we note that <<the differences between the ecological system and the economic system *do not cancel* their *identity* or *uniqueness* elements either>>. And even more. According to the authors of the book <<The Fourth Wave>> metaphorically consider, “Ecology and *economy*- are two sides of *same coin*. Here the currency is OIKOS, our planet is the Earth, the cradle of the whole life. *Ecology* studies the correlations between the Earth and all its

inhabitants, economy strives *to manage* these relationships. As science, namely as a branch of science, ecology has existed for more than a century or so and during this period it produced revelations that enable economists to manage the planet better than they and their disciples did before in the business world.” (14) Indeed, ecology and economy have, etymologically speaking, a *common root* - *oikos*. Economy has its etymological roots in the Greek *oikonomia* composed of *oikos* = house, household, city and *nomos* = law. *The roots of ecology* as a branch of the scientific knowledge, as a science, are also two Greek words - *oikos* in the sense above mentioned and *logos* = *science, speech, lecture, order*.

The root <<eco>> is also present in the name of both sides of the coin: *eco-nomy* și *ecology*. Both the ecological and the economic are, by structure and content, through their configuration and mechanisms – systemic compositions, in short systems holding their own status. The ecological system and the economic system. By joining the concept <<system>> to <<ecologic>> we get the concept of <<eco-system>> which subsumes, focuses and expresses itself and expresses, for most scientists, if not for all of them, the *ecologic system*. The meaning benefits of triple significance legitimacy: etymological, historical and logical-scientific. <<Eco>> subsumes and expresses the main content of the Greek *oikos* - so what is common to both *ecological* and *economic*, so the *identical* in them. No doubt, the <<the right of the first to come >> works here as well. Nevertheless, semantically and scientifically, the notion <<eco-system>> could be also translated, in our view, as both the concept of *ecological system* and as the *economic system*. (15)

5. The <<eco-eco>> mega-system in reality and in thought

It is now increasingly recognized that the economy and natural environment are *two systemic compositions*, two organic systems that are organically and indestructibly *related*

to each other and just as indestructibly and organically *integrated* with each other in a *new* more elevated and superior *composition* of existence and movement-operation and development. We have given, we do not know how rigorously *the name of mega-system – the eco-eco mega-system*.

The concept of *mega-system, eco-eco*, as well as the concept of ecological system, economic system or system in general has *two main meanings*: the *real* eco-eco mega-system - a structure of a slice of *reality*, in our case the *real eco-eco mega-system* (real economy) that exists objectively, independently of the will and conscience of human beings. In this determination the real eco-eco mega-system at one point became the object of scientific knowledge, a branch of science. This means that it existed before scientific knowledge, and it was and will be throughout knowledge and it will be in the future as part of reality and as object of the scientific knowledge. The *second* meaning of the eco-eco mega-system is of a *theoretical eco-eco system*, product (construction) of the human mind, which through knowledge, takes possession of the *real intellectual eco-eco system*. In our view, *the theoretical eco-eco mega-system* represents a *reflection* with the help of thinking, a copy, a photograph of the real eco-eco mega-system, a *shadow* of it. <<Materials>> out of which and with the help of which they build this mega-system are, generally speaking, the same *from* and *to* which the human mind constructs them.

Basically these <<materials>> are thoughts, words, terms or concepts, categories, ideas, paradigms and even pre-paradigmatic constructions, principles and objective laws that generate movement- functioning of ecological economy, its growth and development. The level and scope of the scientific knowledge of real eco-economy, of the real eco-eco mega-system are given by the degree of concordance of the *theoretical* mega-system with the real mega-system but however high this level, or extended in length, width and depth the *knowledge*

acquired, the two systems *are not and never can get to be identical*. They are and will always be *different*. No matter how successful a photo would be it is not identical with the photographed object. No matter how tight the link between an object and its shadow is, however they denote different realities, even if they share some similarities. As complete as a map of a geo-economic determined space could be, and as numerous and useful the information it provides may prove, it is not *identical* with the *reality*, with the spaces they depict. The map and the respective space remain different things. The map of a country as individualized object can be reproduced in hundreds and thousands of copies, which is *impossible* with the represented geo-economic space.

Here is the place to mention that due to the fact that the real natural environment, the real economy and eco-economy (the eco-eco mega-system) stand for a very diverse reality and they are in a process of continuous diversification. As a result, experts have spoken on and speak about local eco-economy, regional eco-economy, national eco-economy, international, and lately, especially of global or world eco-economy. Simultaneously, it has been spoken especially of European, American, etc. economic *models*. Lately it is about the U.S. economic model, Canadian model, the German and the French ones, the economic models of the Northern European countries, the Japanese model, the Chinese one etc. In order to enlarge the image of models we also add numerous sets of models of growth and economic, social etc. development as well, which were quite frequently <<named >> according to their <<architects and constructors>>. Currently <<Mendeleev's table>> of growth and development was completed, generally speaking, with another box – the box of *eco-economic models*, the models of economy based on following the *ecological* principles. It is beyond any doubt that the names of most of the investigated models were correct and have their origins

rooted in the reality of our universe. It is not less true that the realities that concepts and models considered have proved to be highly dynamic. This circumstance began to weaken over time, to reduce the correlation between a concept, a paradigm, one model or another and the reality that it subsumed or expressed and wanted at a certain time. To make it easier to understand, we mention that the increasing, extending and deepening of the globalization processes of socio-economic life have imposed and still impose not only the completion or alteration of some concepts, categories, idea and paradigms, but they have sharpened the need to find some new concepts, ideas, solutions for the nomination and solving the new global issues. And let us not forget that one of the largest and most complicated cases of globalization is the very *globalization of the economy*. Most, if not *all major* problems of contemporary world are the global problems.

6. Challenges, challenges, and challenges again

6.1. Setting the theoretical conceptual system

The emergence of the science of eco-economy is, in our view, a real leap in the progress of the human knowledge. Its importance is not simply the emergence of *new branches*, apparently, extremely, extremely vigorous in the great tree of knowledge and in the structure of the *new thinking*. As we understand things, the emergence of this new branch of science amounts to "a genuine *gap*" in the strong and durable wall of knowledge. It means the lighting of torches that already lights a <<space>> until recently left in darkness. Now the respective <<space >> is <<conquered>> and taken in possession, at least partly, by mankind. Consequently, *the powers* of man and mankind increase as knowledge, science have always meant, mean now and will mean in future more light, safety and power.

Like other branches of science, eco-economy did not appear suddenly and in a perfect form from the very beginning, with an anatomic-morphological structure completely cohesive and fully matured by matching and linking thought with action, thinking with experience, phenomenon with essence, form with content, confirming, legitimizing true thoughts and ideas, denying false conceptual construction, discovering and correcting its own mistakes, *the eco-economy science* will be able <<produce>> its own <<mirror>> its own language and eventually its own theoretical system. This is *the first* and *one of the biggest challenges*, its own <<site>> open starting with its birth and having no end. Let us not forget that the science of eco-economy <<will be the first to speak>> but will never say its *last* word. It is always absent. The struggle with this challenge is not easy at all, as it may seem at first sight.

On the contrary, it is permanent, difficult, and full of bigger or smaller surprises. In other words it is a system of equations with a huge number of unknowns. Many *factors* are positive, negative and potentially neutral putting their striking stamp on the process as well as on the final outcome. For illustration only, here we mention the following factors:

- *The philosophy* that combatants – researchers rely on, thus accept, support and promote;
- The *methodological position* the researchers of eco-economy lie on;
- The *degree* of arming of the combatants with the advanced opportunities of having access to information and their processing and interpretation capabilities of the stock of information - <<the raw material "truth" is made of>>;
- The *discrepancies*, sometimes important and very important, between reality and appearance, the thickness and density of appearance;
- The *differences* and inconsistencies between what is seen and what is not seen;
- *The complexity* of the ever widening of the reality of past world and of the world of

present realities. And do not forget that although the present is extremely small in duration, as reality it is a composition that combines components of the old world and new world, that the interaction between them can take the form of struggle, of mutual rejection, of mutual rejection, of collaboration, cooperation and many other forms.

- The subjective charge, be it large or small, still present in the personality of the combatants (researchers);
- Other factors whose number by far exceeds the number of above mentioned.

6.2. The place and role of the real ecologic and of the real economic within the real eco-eco mega-system

As already mentioned, the eco-economy, the eco-eco mega-system represents the unity and interaction between economy and the natural environment. The true knowledge and the more complex understanding requires further clarification of *the place* that each of the two components occupies and of *the role* that the two fulfil within the mega-system. This challenge is *particularly topical* also because <<the map>> of knowledge, of the means of knowledge and interpretation of the mega-system continues to be divided into different areas.

The most vivid, most heated controversy take place between *environmentalists* and *economists*. There is a very successful description and presentation of the dialogue that occurs between these researchers in the famous book by Lester Brown – *Eco-economy* (16). According to him:

- Environmentalists consider economy as being part of the environmental system;
 - Economists consider the environment as part of the economy;
 - Environmentalists are the first ones concerned with the limits of the natural environment, of the finite character of the planet and of resources;
- Economists* tend not to recognize such constraints;

- *Environmentalists*, following the signs of nature, think in terms of cycles;
- *Economists* prove a rather linear or curvilinear thinking;
- *Economists* have great confidence in the market;
- Environmentalists often fail to accurately assess the market.

<The gap between *economists* and *ecologists* in their perception of the world at the beginning of the current century cannot be any higher. *Economists* look at the unprecedented global economic growth, trade and international investment and see a *promising* future. They notice with justified pride that the global economy has increased sevenfold since 1950, the income increased from \$ 6 billion in goods and services to 43 billion dollars in 2000, and raising living standards to levels undreamed. *Environmentalists* look at the same growth and believe that it is a result of *burning huge quantities* of artificially cheap fuel, a process that *destabilizes the climate*. They look ahead and see *more intense heat waves*, more devastating *storms*, the *ice caps* melt and the sea level ever growing resulting in restriction of the dry surfaces even in the context of a ever growing world population.

The economists consider *the market* as a *guide* in taking decisions. They respect the market because it can allocate its resources with such an efficiency that cannot ever be achieved by a *central planner*. *The ecologists* relate to the market with less respect because they see *a market that does not say the truth*. *The ecologists* see the economical growth in the last decades, but they also see *an economy that grows in conflict with its support system*, an economy that *rapidly depletes the natural assets of the planet*, moving the global economy towards a development of the environment that will inevitably lead to an *economic decline*. They see the necessity of a complete *reconstruction* of the economy in order to come into compliance with the system.

Noting the variety of the opinions, in this case of the ecologists and of the economists, and especially of their divergent character, we put the following questions: Who is right? Who is closer to the truth and to reality? In our view, the mentioned opinions contain a number of ideas and paradigms that can be the core of some credible answers, that resisting in front of all the questions acquire the value of truth and can be considered authentic knowledge in the heritage of the eco-economy.

Analyzing as carefully as we can “the dialogue” or more correctly “the dialogues”, we detached and we retained the following views:

- a) Although the real economic system has its own identity and functioning and ontological status, *its interdependence* with the natural environment *is neither total nor absolute* but only partial and relative.
- b) Between the surrounding nature and the real economy there are a lot of mutual relations of interdependence, dependence, and interdependence. They are in a continuous *interaction*. The environment influences in a multilateral way the real economy. In turn, the society and the economy have created their own artificial environments that have been implemented in the structure of the natural environment.
- c) The identity relationships, dependence and interdependence existing between the two compositions have generated *a new composition, having a superior organization, existence, operation, and evolution*. This composition represents *an authentic mega-system* that we call the *ecoeco mega-system* – in fact, the real economy.
- d) The ecoeco mega-system is a *contradictory* composition, *a unity of opposites* that presume each other and are linked to each other. The two main opposites of the eco-economy

are and will remain the ecology and the economy.

- e) The divergence of opinions “the ecology of the environment is broader than the economy; the economy is part of the surrounding nature” and the opinion according to which the economy is more comprehensive; it includes nature in its structure and its content. Who is right? Which of the two opinions is closer to the truth? The truth is that the economy exists, functions and develops within the surrounding nature’s system. Moreover, the economy will exist, it will be able to function and to develop normally only as long as the surrounding nature will support it, only as long as the material support of the economy will resist.
- f) It is difficult to establish the boundary between ecology and economy. In this respect, the obstacle is represented by the identity elements awakened in both systems. The human being is, in the same time, an essential component both in ecology, as a biological human being, as well as in the economy, as workforce, capital, production factor, economic actor, etc.
- g) The human being and the human beings play a paradoxical role in the ambient environment “Biologically speaking, says Barry Commoner – people are part of the ambient system, like the elements of a whole. However, the economic society is made in order to exploit the environment as a whole, to produce wealth. Our paradoxical role that we play in the ambient environment as participants and as explorers distorts our picture of it.” (17)

Over the years, especially in the developed countries of the world, people have built an artificial environment through their activity

that continues to create a sensation and an impression that because of this environment, whose engine is considered to be the machineries, people have got rid of their *dependence on* the natural environment. Error, illusion, delusion. Why? At least for the following reasons:

- “*The living creatures* are composed almost exclusively of the same four elements: hydrogen, oxygen, carbon, and nitrogen – four elements that originally formed the initial atmosphere of the Earth.” (18)
- *The source of life* is represented by “the thin air, water and soil of the earth and the sun rays that bathe it”. (19)
- *The natural environment* “is one living machinery, huge and very complex, that constitutes a thin dynamic layer on the surface of the Earth and every human activity *depends on* the perfect state and good functioning of this mechanism”. (20)
- And “no economic system can be considered to be *solid* if its functioning *seriously violates the principles of ecology*” (21)
- h) *The crucial and the decisive factor* in the ecoeco mega-system, in other words within the *eco-economy* is *planet Earth* (the environment). The limits of the economy’s growth and development are given by the planet’s limits to *support* both the economic growth and development. And the most important thing – *an economy tolerated by the environment* and also *on long term, sustainable and viable* in concordance with *the principles of ecology compatible with the principles of ecology compatible* with the environment, which Lester Brown called *eco-economy*, that is ecological or green economy.
- i) *The human being’s domination over the nature*. Preoccupied by the “well-

being” in general, Rene Descartes argued that people should become, by the help of the science and technology, “*possessing masters of the nature*”. “As soon as they have possessed some general notions of physics, tested in some difficult cases, we noticed, he said, how far they could take us and how different they were in comparison with the principles used so far. I considered that I could not keep them secret without making a sin against the law that forces us to contribute, as much as we could to the *general well-being*: they showed me that it was possible to reach valuable knowledge for life and instead of that speculative philosophy that was taught in schools, in order to find a practical one, by which to know the power and action of fire, water, air, stars, sky and of all the things that surrounded us, as well as we knew different jobs, we could use them in the same way for all our objectives *thus, becoming masters and possessors of nature*.”(22)

Paradoxically, for a long time, people believed and unfortunately they still do nowadays, that *one of the essential criteria* of the economic and social development is *the degree of possession, the degree of domination of the human beings upon nature*. Moreover, the extremely accelerated development of the science, technology, informatics and communication, the astonishing growth in speed of the means of transport, and especially the rapidity with which information flows, practically the death of space and time, the manufacturing of some products having the same characteristics of the ones made by nature, as well as the production of some products (goods) that cannot be found in the nature and such other remarkable progresses that induced to many human

beings *the illusion of acquisition, the conquest of an absolute and total independence* towards nature and its forms. Therefore, the human being has conquest the nature, and its economy represents that “body” that is in our planetary *center* in the form of a central axis, around which all the other systems spin around. The human being considers itself the planet’s *lord almighty*, totally independent from it. Again *mistake, illusion and delusion*. How can be a human being totally independent of nature, when this is an organic element of the planet Earth. How can the human being believe that there is an absolute independence when its entire real economy is based on nature, substance, substance, energy and force of nature? Such an understanding of reality, illusions and myths generated by the mentioned mistakes has introduced “*bad elements*” in the attitudes and behaviors of the human beings. Therefore, for most of the economic actors, as well as among the representatives of the economic theory, what mattered and really matters primarily is *the gain, the maximum profit* and because of these their economic domination and not just economic, their domination upon some elements (parts) of nature had and unfortunately still have *a colonial, usurper and destructive character*.

j) *The economy is self-destructive*

The human society along with its economy, exists and moves, functions and develops *in time and space*. The second half of the twentieth century is known as being rich in *economical progresses*. Among these, we mention “an unprecedented global economic growth, of commerce and of international investments (...) the global economy has increased seven times since 1950, the global income has increased from 6 billion \$ in goods and services to 43 billion \$ in 2000, raising living standards

at unbelievable levels.” (23) During this fragment of history, in the advanced world, there was a society of welfare, frequently called “consumer society”. Also during this period, the technical and scientific revolution has clearly stated its dimension in the geographically, its intensity and depth often exceeding most impressive imaginations. The IT and communicational revolution has made, according to some inspired expressions, “for time and space to disappear”. It is worth mentioning, the thawing of the international economic relationships, the international economic integration and not least, there could be seen clear signs of globalization in the economic and social life. This is the way the world looks like, seen in its economic mirror.

Willing to complete the image of Planet Earth, we *have turned to the green mirror* and this is what we have noticed: the same economic increase and development has been *presented* as being the product of burning huge materials of cheap fossil fuels, which contributed a lot to climate *destabilization*. Simultaneously, this mirror has presented waves of intense heat, storms and more devastating tornadoes, ice caps are melting, the higher sea levels, and restricting land surface, even in the context in which the planet’s population is growing. (24)

So, two mirrors, two images and beyond them two states. AS Lester Brown Noticed “while the economists see explosive economic indicators, the ecologists see an economy that deteriorates climate with unpredictable consequences. The economy follows the way of *self-destruction*. Moreover, the mutual relationships between the two elements of the ecoeco are seriously deteriorated and thus, the dangers that are threatening more and more the *state* (the functioning and evolution) of the entire planet. *The most eloquent form of the*

ecology's and of the eco-economy's self-destruction is the crises in which they are struggling.

k) *The challenge of challenges – the conversion of the economy in eco-economy*

The science of economy has a lot of challenges. In our opinion, a complete inventory is impossible to be done. The “Mendeleev-like” picture of the economic sciences’ challenges will always be completed with new blocks and new “elements”. But it will always remain *open*. This is the case with all the branches of science. The history of science, of all its branches, tells us and proves to us the fact that the science has the *first* word but it does not have the *last* word. Acknowledging this truth, we sought to find a challenge of challenges among the ones already identified in the private economy as reality and as a science. This is “*the conversion of economy in eco-economy*”. This was stated by Lester Brown who noticed the fact that “the conversion of the economy in an eco-economy represents an extraordinary challenge. There is no precedent in the action of transforming an economy based mainly on the market forces in an economy formed on the principles of ecology” (25)

Why is this conversion necessary? Lester Brown considers that “today’s global economy has been formulated by the market forces and not by the principles of ecology. Unfortunately, due to *failure* in reflecting *total costs* of the goods and services, the market provides information that mislead the decisive economic factors at all levels. This aspect has created a *distorted* economy, which is in conflict with the ecosystem of the planet – an economy that *destroys its own natural support systems*.” (26)

“The market does not recognize the ecologic concepts of tolerable production and does not respect the balance of nature.” (27) According to Lester Brown, “An economy is

an economy that satisfies our demands without destroying the perspectives of the future generations to fulfil their needs, as the Brundtland Committee has underlined 15 years ago.” (28)

Following these ideas, Lester Brown notices: There have been enough records regarding the fact that, gradually, our global economy *undermines itself* on several levels. If we want for the economic progress to continue, we have only *the small chance of systematically restructure the global economy, in order to make it bearable* for the environment.” (29)

These truths are undoubtedly confirmed by the *ecologic crises*, by the deep cracks of the correlations between the economy’s structural links as well as between the different components of the planet Earth, plus the serious contradictions between economy and nature. And we must not forget the fact that all or almost all these phenomena and realities have their source in the *models* of economic and social growth and development that have become more and more not only *un-ecological* but also *against ecology*.

7. In search for a better world

The people regarded as living human beings, and not only they, are obviously and constantly concerned with the improvement of their situation (state). Mentioning this general feature of the living, Karl R. Popper noticed that “Everything that is living is *in search for a better world*. The people, the animals, the plants and even the unicellular organisms are continuously active. Even in sleep the body actively maintains that certain state of sleep, actively defends itself of what is disturbing, of the environment. Any organism is continuously preoccupied with *finding solutions*. And the solutions appear from the evaluation of its *state* and of its environment, trying to improve them. The attempt to solve them, often proves to be wrong, leading to worsening. Then, other solving attempts, other test movements follow. Thus, along with life – even from the

unicellular organisms, something extremely new appears (something that has never been before: problems and active attempts to solve them evaluations, values, trial and error) (30)

The actors implied in solving the problems are researchers, finders, discoverers. The activity, the anxiety or the curiosity that is given by the research are essential elements for life, for everlasting hope, for search, evaluation, finding, for learning, for value creation, for improvements, but also for the everlasting mistake, as well as for non-values' realization. The items listed are part of life.

Karl Popper believes that "the bodies searching for a better world find invent and change new environments. They build nests, dams, mountains, but their creation with the most significant consequences is obviously the reshaping the earth's atmosphere by enriching it with oxygen; in turn, a consequence of discovering the fact that sunlight can serve as food. Discovering this inexhaustible source of food and of the multiple methods of capturing sunlight, has created flora. And the prediction for the planet as a food source created fauna. We have created ourselves by inventing our specific human language "(31) and influencing our mind and thought with it. The instinct, the intuition and the science (knowledge) have constituted and are still constituting the main elements of the search for a better world. The sentences uttered by people represent "the main instrument with which they can describe their states." Reaching this point we have to mention the fact that the sentences help people express objectively the truth discovered by human knowledge. Mainly in the sciences of nature – "the search for truth is connected to everything that is good and impressive of what life created in search for a better life." (32)

But the reality also shows us that people, searching for a better world, have committed many errors, sometimes big ones. The saying

that "everything that is alive commits errors" is true. As K. Popper underlined, "it is obviously impossible to anticipate all the unwanted consequences of our actions. The science of nature is our biggest hope here: the method is to correct the mistakes." (33) In this way of understanding the problem, it is obvious that the expansion and the deepening of the scientific knowledge, by which the society and the human beings take intellectual control over a growing field of reality represents and will represent the most probable way to follow in order to achieve big successes. In our opinion, the science, the knowledge is the compass that help people to orient and to lead its ship on the stormy waves of time. We like to believe that our words, even if they are not rigorous and exact, are somehow close to the truth. Towards the end of the 20th century, the science and the scientific knowledge has recorded remarkable progresses, and according to some appreciations during this period lived approximately 90% of all the scientists who have ever existed on Earth. We also like to notice the fact that presently the human beings, the contemporary world acknowledge an invisible revolution in informatics and communications, whose main unit is "nano". These powerful engines and forces push the human beings in a society based on scientific knowledge. However, in spite of these realities, the present society and its economy have much more problems than in any other past period, problems having no answers, no solutions. Paradoxically, the progress of the scientific knowledge discovers and creates new and new problems that are waiting to be solved.

8. A free market or another type of market?

A brief foray into the history of the economic thinking convinces us easily that since the modern age, the economists have given the market a special role. In other words, the market has captured more and more the attention of the economists. For *Adam Smith* the market represents the regulator of the labor division. Its volume determines the level reached by the division, this process, this accelerator of production. Moreover, the market is the place where “the invisible hand”, the offer and the demand intermingle and are balanced automatically on the market, through prices. *Simon de Sismondi* considered that the mass consumers, their demands, the proportions of their consumption and of their incomes – all these form the market for which every single producer works. *Raymonde Barre* defines the market as being a “network of relationships between the agents who make the shift, that are rigorously communicated through certain means.” According to him, the market consists of distinct economic centers, linked together by means of exchange networks, joined by a network of forces. These centers are production centers, supply of production factors and of goods. They are linked by a functional solidarity that comes out from the necessity of their interest in developing the economic activity. For Michel Didier “the market is a social institution.” For him, “the market appears as an overall means of communication, by which sellers and buyers inform each other about products and prices before transactions are done. The markets are communication networks.”

J. Bremond and A. Gélédan write in the Economic and Social Dictionary that “the market is the place where the offers of the sellers meet the demands of the buyers, being adjusted at a certain price. The market is thus, a way of confronting demand with offer in order to make a change of products, services or capitals.”

A quite remarkable definition, at least for us, belongs to the Polish economist Oskar Lange. He noticed that “the market is the first ordinator put in the service of man, a self-regulating machinery ensuring the balance of the economic activities..” (34) D’Avenal noticed in the language of his era, of the honest liberalism: „Even in the situation when nothing is free in a state, *the price* of the things remains free and would not be enslaved to anyone. The price of silver, land, labour, the prices of all the goods and services have never ceased being free; no legal constriction, no agreement between people have enslaved them.” (35)

In *Fernand Braudel's* opinion “These considerations implicitly admit that the market that is *not directed* by anyone, it is the *mechanism driving* the whole economy. The economic development in Europe, and even in the world, would be *the development of a market economy* that has constantly increased its area, including in *its rational order* more and more people, more and more economic communications, close and remote, which tend to create, *all together*, a *unity* of the world.” (36)

Still, what are the status and the condition of the market in the nowadays world? A comprehensive answer fully argued by confirmed facts and thus legitimized, not by questionable opinions sometimes even refuted by reality, does not fit in the pages of a communication no matter how extensive it might be. Therefore, we will limit ourselves to not more than a summary, yet as comprehensive as possible, insisting on the following:

- Market - conceptually, its anatomical-morphological structure, the forms (types), the way of operation and development, its place and its role in the contemporary economy continue to be the subject of extensive and lively theoretical, methodological and practical confrontations.

- Trying to summarize, a group, of course relative, we believe that on the large field of confrontations about market one can

generally distinguish *two trends, two approaches*, namely: a) classical and contemporary *liberal approach* and b) *non-liberal approach* with its subdivisions as well as the former.

- In the *liberal approach*, the market is a general mechanism, *self-regulating*; it is comprehensive and accomplishes, performs and assures in itself, through the *spontaneous action*, the *efficient allocation of resources*, of production factors, *orients* the economic movement according to the individual needs and interests of the economic actors, while ensuring the maintenance of balance between the links of the social division of labour, between supply and demand. The *economic basis* of the market economy is formed by the private ownership of means of production, the fundament of autonomy and independence of actors and therefore the base of the freedom of thought and movement of production factors, goods, capital and economic actors.

- The most important constitutive <<parts>> of the market and its mechanism are: profit, demand, offer, the interplay between demand and offer, free competition and price.

- This free market is by definition a pure and perfect market and ensures also pure and perfect functioning of the free market economy.

- According to the second approach, the market is indeed the most important mechanism of operation and development of economic life. The advocates and the supporters of this way of understanding the market and the market economy believe, however, that the market economy and the free market economy are not the same thing. The two concepts are not identical and should not be confused. Saying these and referring to the era we live in, we feel the need to add that in the debates that take place, it is often not said what is a confirmed truth, and, for various reasons, some truth containing paradigms are premeditatedly similar. As an example we can here mention a work, remarkable in our opinion, which presents a

total of 23 things we are **NOT** told about capitalism. (37)

To exemplify, we shall present in a summary the main ideas contained in Chapter 1 of the book, entitled: "*There is no free market*"

"*What you are said*"

"Markets should be free. If governments dictate what market actors can and cannot do, the resources cannot get where they would be most effectively used. If they cannot do what they consider profitable, people lose their desire to invest and innovate. Thus, if the government limits or sets a threshold for rents, the owners lose their desire to maintain the properties and build new ones. Or if the government imposes a restriction on the types of financial products that can be sold, then the contracting parties, which could have benefited from innovative transactions that could meet their specific needs, would not be able to obtain the potential gain from a free contact. People need to be "*free to choose*" as said by the title of a famous book written by the prophet of the free market, Milton Friedman." (38)

"*What you are not said*"

"The free market *does not exist*. Each market has certain rules and limitations that *restrict* freedom of choice. A market *seems* to be free only as we accept unconditionally the default restrictions, which we can no longer see. There cannot be defined how <<free>> a market is. *The definition is a political one*. The usual statement of the free market economists, that they *try to defend* the market from political interference, is rather false. *The government is always involved*, and the free market advocates are *politically motivated* as much as anyone. *The first step* to understanding capitalism is *overcoming the myth that there objectively is a <<free market>>*.

The paradigmatic assumption, that nowadays there is no, and can never be, such thing as a pure and perfect free market, all-comprising and all-knowing, omnipotent, regulated by nothing and fully unregulated or deregulated, directed by nothing and completely

undirected but totally spontaneous, expresses a *truth confirmed*.

And yet apparently there is something more that needs to be said. Okay, okay - there is no free market, but what is there? In our opinion there is a market or, as Maurice Allais writes, a markets economy. (39)

A short journey through the history of economic thinking provides us with no little evidence - arguments that show convincingly that the market and the market economy are, as mentioned, much older than the capitalist market economy. The same journey provides unequivocal evidence showing that the presence of *free competition* – a fundamental element of the free market economy-, has never been comprehensive, but for a short period of time it was dominant especially in England and that it *committed suicide* according to the expression of K. Marx. The place of the morphological-anatomical atomized structure of the economic actors, of the capitalist economy, has changed due to objective economic laws – concentration (accumulation of capital, concentration of production), centralization of capital and production, of economic activity in general, competition law, uneven development – have generated a new form of capital, the monopolist capital, which personified itself as a specific type of economic actor – the monopoly in various forms: cartel, syndicate, trust, concern, corporation, etc. At this stage, competition itself has changed both its content and its forms of expression. Basically, at a growing scale, free competition gave way to monopolistic competition; full competition - pure and perfect - became imperfect competition, etc. At the same time, the mechanisms, the means and the methods of action have changed. This very thing made the subject of research of political economy become richer and more complex. The new economic reality could not fail to attract the attention of the representatives of this branch of science and not only. For illustration we mention that in 1933 two relevant works were published: the

book of the economist *Joan Robinson*, Professor at the Faculty of Economics in Cambridge University, entitled "*The economics of imperfect competition*" and, again in Cambridge, but in the United States this time, *E.H. Chamberlain's* work, entitled "*The theory of the monopolistic competition*". Also for illustration, we add the name of JM Keynes and several of his works, of which the most important, for its content and cognitive, methodological and applicative value, is "*The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*" (1936).

Keynes's thinking and that of his followers, in fact Keynes's *model* was in a sense <<the orienting compass>> and the theoretical basis of operation and evolution of the Western economy and society after World War II until the early '70s of the twentieth century. The name given to this society is <<*consumer society*>>. The world economic crisis of 1973-1975 interrupted the way of the industrial consumer society. The same crisis, specifically the way it was addressed, understood and explained, constituted a clear *rejection* of Keynes thinking and a *powerful return of neoclassical liberalism*. Keynes's theory and the policies that had been inspired by it were brought to the *culprits* <<*lodge*>>. In this context, two schools of thinking were set up. *First*, there was a *new - and final* - attempt to make a *synthesis* between the *neoclassical* and the Keynesian analyses, synthesis performed differently than the first. Its authors were <<the theorists of the imbalance>> led by the French economist Edmond Malinvaud. This current of thinking believes that imbalances and long-term unemployment are possible in a world where prices and wages are flexible, but it considers that these phenomena are caused by an *insufficiency of global demand* - Keynesian unemployment and an *insufficiency of offer* - classic unemployment.

The second trend is the ultra-liberalism (Hayek - the foremost representative), the monetarism or perhaps more accurately, the monetarisms (whose no.1 representative is

Milton Friedman), plus the neoclassical economics (foremost representatives being Robert Lucas, Thomas Sargent and Neil Wallace)

The third monetarist trend is the supply-side economics of (Arthur Laffer at the forefront of followers). (40)

<<The victory >> of neoclassical liberalism was an apparent victory and on short term only. The end of the first decade of the third millennium saw a complex and deep economic and financial crisis, a crisis of governance and administration, as well, which, in their interaction, resulted in a deep rift in the operation and development of economic, financial-monetary and social life of the current world.

This crisis, more accurately the assembly of crises, that swept our world, closes a period and represents a milestone and a starting point in the human history, a main sign of the renewal of society and its great structures. Economically, the crisis developed as soon as in 2008 contradicted many paradigms of liberal and especially neo-liberal thinking and several steps of orientation and political action of a neoclassical-liberal nature. "The global economy lies in ruins. Although unprecedented fiscal and monetary aid prevented the financial collapse in 2008 from triggering complete destruction of the world economy, the global crash of 2008 remains the second largest economic crisis after the Great Depression."(41)

It has now become much more visible that the notions, the concepts of free competition, free market economy, pure and perfect competition, all-comprising market and all-knowing market, perfect market, totally spontaneous economic movement and others of the same arsenal are worthless cognitively and practically, and therefore false, and circulate in the big world as counterfeit coins or other fake things.

Simultaneously, the crisis confirmed a whole range of paradigms from the Keynesist and neokeynesist (postkeynesist) thinking arsenal and practical orientation, considered, until

recently, and in many cases even now, as lacking authentic cognitive and applicative value. And it does not stop here. Why? Because the new economy, being born now, necessarily requires a new economic thinking, as well.

Notes

(1) Handy Charles, *Epoca Irațiunii*, Editura Codex, 2007; *Pelerina Goală*, Editura Codex, 2007; *Elefantul și Puricele*, Editura Codex, 2007.

(2) Popper R. Karl, *Filosofie socială și filosofia științei. Antologie editată de David Miller*, Editura Trei, Bucharest, 2000, p. 60.

(3) Op.cit., pag. 62.

(4) Marx K., *Capitalul*, vol. I, in: Marx, Engels, *Opere vol. 23*, Editura Politică, Bucharest, 1966, p.191 (emphasis added by author AN).

(5) Handy Charles, *Epoca Irațiunii. O gândire nouă pentru o lume nouă*, Editura Codex, Bucharest, 2007, p. 23 (emphasis added by author AN).

(6) Arendt Hannah, *Condiția umană*, Ed. Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 2007, p.13 (emphasis added by author AN).

(7) Idem (6) (emphasis added by author AN).

(8) Idem (6) (emphasis added by author AN).

(9) Idem (6) (emphasis added by author AN).

(10) Arendt Hannah, Op. Cit., p. 8 (emphasis added by author AN).

(11) Negucioiu Aurel, Petrescu Dacinia Crina, *Introducere în eco-economie*, Ed. Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2006, p.35.

(12) Negucioiu Aurel, Petrescu Dacinia Crina, Op. Cit., pp.25-36.

(13) Bonnet Jaques, *Marile metropole mondiale*, Ed. Institutul European, Iași, 2000, p. 209.

(14) Bryant Herman, Mehrtens Susan, *Al patrulea val*, Ed. Antet, pp.108-109 (emphasis added by author AN).

(15) Negucioiu Aurel, Petrescu Dacinia Crina, Op. Cit., p.37 (emphasis added by author AN).

- (16) Brown Lester, *Eco-economia. Crearea unei economii pentru planeta noastră*, Ed. Tehnică, Bucharest, 2001, pp.1-5 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (17) Commoner Barry, *Cercul care se închide*, Ed. Politică, Bucharest, 1989, p.11 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (18) Commoner Barry, Op. Cit, p.21.
- (19) Commoner Barry, Op. Cit, p.14.
- (20) Commoner Barry, Op. Cit, p.20.
- (21) Commoner Barry, Op. Cit, p.270.
- (22) Decartes René, *Discurs despre metoda de a ne conduce bine națiunea și a căuta adevărul în științe*, Ed. Academiei Române, Bucharest, 1990, p.146 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (23) Brown Lester, Op. Cit., p.2.
- (24) Brown Lester, Op. Cit., p.3.
- (25) Brown Lester, Op. Cit., p.89 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (26) Ibidem (25), p.86 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (27) Ibidem (26).
- (28) Ibidem (26).
- (29) Ibidem (26), p.89 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (30) Popper R. Karl, *În căutarea unei lumi mai bune*, Ed. Humanitas, Bucharest, 1987, p.5 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (31) Popper R. Karl, Op. cit., p.6 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (32) Op.cit., p.6.
- (33) Op.cit., p.6 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (34) After Fernand Braudel, *Jocurile schimbului, vol. 1*, Ed. Meridiane, Bucharest, 1985, p.267.
- (35) After Op. cit. (34), p.267 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (36) Fernand Braudel, Op. cit., p.267 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (37) Chang Ha-Joon, *23 de lucruri care nu și se spun despre capitalism*. "O demistificare strălucită a unor mituri ale capitalismului" (John Gray, The Observer).
 "Disciple of Stephen Stiglitz and one of the most iconoclastic economists of these times, Ha-Joon Chang *removes* some of the *myths* of capitalism and of the world we live in, including the myth of the *free market* or that technology is the way to progress for everyone. One by one, the principles of economic doctrines received for granted are presented in the historical context of formations, before becoming self-evident. Globalization does not make the world richer. Poor countries prove more entrepreneurial spirit than the rich ones. Better paid managers do not get better results. Based on the actual data, this book about money, equality, freedom and greed proves that *free market does not only work against people, but it is also an inefficient way to manage the economy*" (second cover of the book).
- (38) Chang Ha-Joon ,Op.cit., p.19 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (39) Allais Maurice, *L'Europe face a son avenir: que faire?*, Editions Clement Juglar, Editions Robert Lafont, 1991, especially note 18, p.142.
- (40) Valier Jaques, *Scurtă istorie a gândirii economice de la Aristotel până azi*, Ed. Campana, Bucharest, pp. 122-132 (emphasis added by author AN).
- (41) Chang Ha-Joon, Op.Cit., p.13.